

Appl. No. 10/020,529
Amdt. Dated
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2004

Docket No. EN11358
Customer No.. 27940

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 remain in the application.

Claims 7 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities: "détente" should be "detent". In response, Applicants have amended claims 7 and 8 to eliminate the "e" from the word detent.

Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: "the at least on vertical wall" should be "the at least one vertical wall". In response, Applicants have amended claim 8 such that the "on" cited by the OA now reads — one —.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humphreys, et al. (USPN 5,825,874) in view of Richard, et al. (USPN 5,481,889).

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite the rotational member comprising a retention hood capable of receiving the detachable member. Support for this amendment is found in claim 2 as originally filed in conjunction with page 5, lines 1-2 of the specification.

Applicants note that the OA submits that Richard teaches a retention hood at col. 4, line 49. Applicants note that Richard, at col. 3, line 49 Richard describes "bar retainers" which are right angle supports for coupling the bar, which sits perpendicular to the lid, to the lid itself. Applicants respectfully submit that these bar retainers are not hooded members into which the detachable member may be inserted. Applicants note that such a right angle piece, when applied to Humphreys, would at best be a secondary support, and would be incapable of receiving the detachable member. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Humphreys and Richard fails to teach the hooded member claimed by Applicants. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection in light of the amendment and these comments.

Appl. No. 10/020,529
Amdt. Dated
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2004

Docket No. EN11358
Customer No.: 27940

Claims 3-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have amended claim 3 to recite the limitations of claims 1 and 2, to put them in condition for allowance.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

If any matter with respect to this application would be more easily handled by telephone, Applicants' attorney is available at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department
1700 Belle Meade Court
Energy Systems Group
Lawrenceville, GA 30043
Customer Number: 27940

By: 

Philip H. Burrus, IV
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,432

Telephone: 770.338.3227
Fax No.: 770.338.3413

Attachments